

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32  
March 2023

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT  
(AMENDED)  
RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO ADVISE OF SCHEDULING CONFLICTS**

Case Number: 23-2397, 23-2398Short Case Caption: Stryker European Operations Holdings LLC v. OsteoMed LLCParty Name(s): OsteoMed LLC

**INFORMATION:** The court uses this form to determine whether and when to schedule cases for oral argument. Arguing counsel may be changed later, but a motion to reschedule is required once the court schedules argument. Please plan in advance to adhere to the limit on the number of arguing counsel in Fed. Cir. R. 34(e).

**Argument Waiver**     ☐ My party intends to waive oral argument.

NOTE: Filers checking this box must still complete the below sections. **The court may still schedule this case for oral argument even if any party intends to waive argument.** If scheduled, parties may still elect to waive argument using the response to notice of oral argument form.

**Other Parties Representing Interests**

☐ Counsel for another party will represent my party's interests at oral argument

NOTE: If this box is checked, skip the remaining sections. Any argument date will be selected based on conflict dates for counsel arguing on behalf of your party.

<b>Name of Expected Arguing Counsel</b>	Devon C. Beane
---	----------------

**Dates Unavailable**

Do you have dates of unavailability within the specific sessions identified by the court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts in your case?

☒ Yes                      ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing **up to ten dates** of unavailability and **include a statement showing good cause for each date.** Dates without good cause or that do not pertain to arguing counsel (e.g., client conflicts) will not be accepted. The court will only accept dates for one counsel and only if that counsel has filed an entry of appearance. The Clerk's Office will evaluate and note accepted or rejected conflict dates; counsel may contact the Clerk's Office about re-filing if dates are rejected. See Fed. Cir. R. 34(d); Practice Notes to Rule 34.

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32  
March 2023

**Potential Case Conflicts**

Are there other pending cases before this court (regardless of case status) in which expected arguing counsel in this case also expects to argue?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing those cases.

I certify the above information and any attached statement is complete and accurate. I further certify that I will update my notice should new conflicts arise or existing conflicts change.

Date: 10/29/2024

Signature: /s/ Devon C. Beane

Name: Devon C. Beane

**ATTACHMENT TO RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO ADVISE OF  
SCHEDULING CONFLICTS**

<b>Case Number:</b>	23-2397, 23-2398
<b>Short Case Caption:</b>	Stryker European Operations Holdings LLC v. OsteoMed LLC
<b>Party Name(s):</b>	OsteoMed LLC

**Dates Unavailable**

Do you have dates of unavailability within the specific sessions identified by the court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts in your case?

Yes.

<b>Dates of Unavailability</b>	<b>Reason</b>
February 3, 2025 – February 7, 2025	<p>Scheduled participation in a trial the week immediately following this oral argument session.</p> <p>Jury Trial is scheduled from February 10, 2025 through February 14, 2025 in <i>Abbott Laboratories v. Grifols Diagnostic Solutions Inc., et al.</i>, Case 1:19-cv-06587 (N.D. Ill.).</p> <p>Ms. Beane is lead counsel in the above-referenced matter and is scheduled to appear and argue at the trial.</p>
February 10, 2025	Overlaps with Jury Trial scheduled to begin on February 10, 2025 in <i>Abbott Laboratories v. Grifols Diagnostic Solutions Inc., et al.</i> , Case 1:19-cv-06587 (N.D. Ill.).

Dates of Unavailability	Reason
	Ms. Beane is lead counsel in the above-referenced matter and is scheduled to appear and argue at the trial.

### **Potential Case Conflicts**

Are there other pending cases before this court (regardless of case status) in which expected arguing counsel in this case also expects to argue?

Yes.

Ms. Beane is also expected to argue in the following case:

- *Stryker Corporation v. OsteoMed LLC*, No. 23-1925 (Lead).